

REMARKS

Double Patenting Rejection

In the Office Action, the pending claims of the application were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting in view of certain claims of U.S. Patent 6,625,195 (“the ‘195 patent”). In response, Applicant herewith submits a Terminal Disclaimer in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.321(c), indicating that the present application and the ‘195 patent are commonly owned. The appropriate fee for the Terminal Disclaimer is also enclosed. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the double patenting rejection should be withdrawn.

Section 102 Rejection

Claims 2-9 and 18 were rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,513,203 to Damen. Applicant has herein amended claim 2 to include the features of dependent claim 10. Specifically, claim 2 has been amended to clarify that the second reflector assembly includes “a polyhedral prism waveguide having a non-reflecting surface facing the first non-linear semiconductor material and having at least one totally-reflecting surface for transversely redirecting incident photonic emissions to a different longitudinal location of the polyhedral prism waveguide.” Damen does not disclose this feature; therefore, Damen does not anticipate amended claim 2.

Applicant has canceled claim 10, and has additionally amended claim 11 to depend from claim 2 rather than cancelled claim 10. By virtue of their dependence upon amended claim 2, Damen also does not anticipate claims 3-9.

Applicant has also amended independent method claim 18 to clarify that the second reflector assembly includes “a polyhedral prism waveguide having a non-reflecting surface facing the first non-linear semiconductor material and having at least one totally-reflecting surface for transversely redirecting incident photonic emissions to a different longitudinal location of the polyhedral prism waveguide.” For similar reasons, therefore, Damen does not anticipate amended claim 18.

Drawing Objections

In the Office Action, the drawings were objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) because “they fail to show [a] first mirror as described in the specification.” Applicant submits that the drawings as filed show every feature of the invention recited in the claims. Nevertheless, in order to expedite allowance of the claims, Applicant has amended claim 2 to recite that the “second” reflector assembly include a polyhedral prism waveguide. Similarly, Applicant has amended claims 12 and 15 to clarify that the “first” reflector assembly includes a mirror stack. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the drawing objections should be withdrawn.

The Office should note that Applicant has also amended claim 15 to depend from independent claim 2.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the claims. If the Examiner is of the opinion that the instant application is in condition for disposition other than allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to the

undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below in order that the Examiner's concerns may be expeditiously addressed.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 30, 2004



Mark G. Knedeisen
Reg. No. 42,747

KIRKPATRICK & LOCKHART LLP
Henry W. Oliver Building
535 Smithfield Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15222

Ph. (412) 355-6342
Fax (412) 355-6501